

staff would represent a break with tradition. I think it would not be in the best interests of the committee, of the Senate, or of our national security.

I want to say one other thing not related to Senator ROCKEFELLER and our difference of opinion but something that is of great concern. It is becoming apparent in statements from some of my colleagues across the aisle over the past several days and weeks that there is a growing campaign of criticism aimed at the President, the war against terrorism, and what may be a necessary military confrontation with Iraq and Saddam Hussein, not to mention now the entire business with North Korea. It would appear to me as an individual Senator on the Armed Services Committee and on the Intelligence Committee that any criticism on foreign policy does not stop at the water's edge. It also appears now that is true of national security as well.

In this regard, I don't question any Member's honest intent or difference of opinion relative to our national security, not to mention their patriotism. That is not what I am talking about. We need healthy debate. We have strong differences of opinion. That is our obligation as Senators.

But when we hear statements that this Nation is no better prepared, intelligence-wise, than we were prior to 9/11, that is not right. Nothing hurts the truth so much as stretching it. And, boy, that is a stretch. That is not only not true but it borders on the politics of opportunism.

Our job on the Intelligence Committee is to conduct serious, tough, proactive, and vigorous oversight, and to hold the intelligence community accountable, as well, I think, as being a champion for their mission and enabling the community to safeguard our Nation. That is why we should not allow the Intelligence Committee to split into partisan camps during these perilous times.

Finally, in regard to this whole business of holding up the chairmanships and transfer of power and the Senate's business, we all ran through partisan gauntlets of sorts to gain the privilege of being here—some more than others. Yet the special fabric that binds this institution in purpose and in achievement is bipartisan.

I am the first to admit that no political party has an exclusive patent on common sense or can lay claim to what is absolutely right. Personally, I try very hard to work with my good Democrat colleagues and friends. And, yes, they are my friends. Now, to be sure, we have our differences, but for the most part we work together, and we try on the other fellow's boots. Sometimes they pinch—sometimes they pinch really hard—but we get the foot to fit and we get something done.

I try to be the best Member I know how to be. That is tempered by over 30 years of public service as a staffer and a House and Senate Member. I am a piece of old furniture around here.

But to my friends now in the minority and acting as if you are in the majority, that is the rub. Part of what we are is what the other side allows us to be. And during these past 8 or 9 days, you have had us on short reins—in fact, no reins at all. And I know this: If this obstructionism keeps up—the space, the staffing, the ratios, the blue slips, the rules on judges, and Lord knows what is next—you will tear that special fabric that holds us together as the Senate of the United States.

If we do not end this business and get to the business of the Nation, and understand there is a majority and a minority and that the majority rules, we will open up a wound further that will not heal without significant price and scar, not to mention public ridicule for our institution.

The sad thing is, I say to my colleagues, we did not have to go down this road.

Mr. President, I always figure it is a good thing to be a little bit nicer than is called for. I do not think too many Members would call me too nice. But in trying to be a little bit nicer than is called for, you shouldn't take too much guff.

My colleagues across the aisle, it is time to end the guff.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, before the Senator from Kansas leaves the floor, I just want to say to him that in all my years in the Senate, that is one of the finest speeches I have ever heard. And I think it came at a particularly good time, as we remind ourselves, once again, what this body is supposed to be like. No matter how bitterly we contest these elections, at the end of the day we are here to do the people's business. And to fail to even take the elementary steps to make it possible for us to get started in doing that is an enormous disservice to this institution and to the country.

Beyond that, I think it is important to remember what the Intelligence Committee is all about. I think the Senator, by laying out the history of the committee, and the tradition of the committee, and the way it has protected sensitive information, and the way it has, in effect, insisted upon bipartisan cooperation, has done a great service for the Senate. That was a speech we needed to hear, given at precisely the right time.

I thank my friend again.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. DOLE). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I judge the parliamentary situation is such that the Senator can speak as in morning business for not to exceed 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no restriction at this point.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Chair.

#### MEETING OF THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, tomorrow morning the Senate Armed Services Committee will conduct a closed hearing with the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs as our witnesses. This came about in a routine way as a consequence of a letter that Senator LEVIN, the chairman of the committee, and I as ranking member, sent to the Secretary on January 8.

Senator LEVIN and I have worked closely in the joint management of this committee, and I expressed to him, following the Christmas recess, the need that I perceived for Members to get a current briefing with regard to those issues relating to the Department of Defense, obviously one being the deployment to Iraq, the situation in Iraq, the situation in Korea, and other matters—generally speaking, the continuing war that the President is engaging against terrorist.

I am about to read the letter we sent. I have been very much involved in these issues as a member of this committee. Senator LEVIN and I start our 25th year as Senators, and we have been together on that committee now this quarter of a century. We have worked together very closely in a trusting relationship, and that continues.

We have had our strong differences, particularly when we manage the annual Defense authorization bill. We have taken the two desks of our respective leaders here and debated issues during those 25 years. We have our differences with regard to certain issues as they relate to Iraq.

Interestingly enough, we planned a joint trip to Korea some 18 months ago, but that trip just could not be developed.

I bring that background only to say this letter reflects a perfectly routine meeting that we have had through the years and the joint desire on behalf of the committee to have these two very important witnesses appear to bring us up to their current knowledge with regard to these issues. It is a routine matter.

There is some concern that we have summoned the Secretary of Defense to be here tomorrow morning as a consequence of some publicity that has been put forward of recent regarding the relationships between the Congress and the administration and, most specifically, the Department of Defense. Some of that publicity relates to a conference Republican Senators held last week. I have always followed the rule—

and will continue to do so—that those are private matters between the respective conferences of this side of the aisle and that side of the aisle, and what transpires is simply our business.

Nevertheless, certain facts have emanated from the one held by the Republicans.

Coincidentally, the morning after that conference, Senator LEVIN and I—just the two of us from the Senate—had a breakfast meeting with the Secretary of Defense and about, I would say, eight of his senior members to discuss a wide range of issues. At that meeting, we brought up the subject of this letter, and the Secretary said: Of course, let's schedule whatever time you want. I have the letter. I am ready to come.

In fact, he had just briefed the House Armed Services Committee in a similar way.

This letter is straightforward.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WARNER. It states in part:

Dear Mr. Secretary, we are writing to request that you or your Deputy, together with Joint Chiefs . . . testify before the Armed Services Committee next week, in both open and closed session—

We have now decided it will be just in closed session—

on current and potential U.S. military operations. . . .

And the letter flows thereafter. It will be part of the RECORD.

In no way is this to be construed as a summons to the Secretary by myself or Senator LEVIN with respect to our concerns about the consultation process between the Department of Defense and the Congress.

To amplify on my concern about certain inquiries that have been received in my office in the last roughly 36 hours, I do feel very strongly about the situation in Iraq; likewise, the situation in Korea. I believe every Member of this body feels very strongly about it.

Frankly, candidly, and proudly, I say that our President has exhibited the extraordinary leadership with regard to particularly the situation in Iraq and the manner in which he has taken steps in the international arena—the United Nations, the Security Council—working with the heads of state and governments of nations which are now and have been close friends and allies in trying to bring about peace in this world.

I have said in this Chamber, and I will continue to say, that in my humble career, almost a quarter of a century in this body and some 5 years I spent in the Pentagon where I was exposed to international situations, foremost among them the war in Vietnam, Mr. President, the situation in Iraq is one of the most complex and serious situations I have ever witnessed in my

professional career as a public servant. I think it requires the highest degree of attention that it is receiving by our President, that it has, is, and will be received by this august body, the Senate, and working with the House as a Congress as a whole. I think our President has received strong support with regard to the steps he has taken.

I was proud with Senator MCCAIN, Senator BAYH, and Senator LIEBERMAN to draw up a resolution which was passed by this body on which, for the record—and it is in the Record—Senator LEVIN and I had disagreements, but there was a strong endorsement of the actions being taken by our President.

In that context, I think the consultation process between the President and his principal Cabinet officers and others in the Congress has to be stronger than it has ever been because of the complexity of this situation. That is why I urged Senator LEVIN to have this hearing tomorrow. That is why I am taking other steps to see that our committee, the Senate Armed Services Committee, which presumably in the not too distant future I will be named chairman, receives the maximum amount of information, not only that it desires but that it needs to properly perform our oversight process, that it needs to properly not only relate to our constituents but to members of the administration to convey our feelings and views which indeed could be contrary in some respects to actions taken or that are about to be taken by the President and others as it relates to this situation.

North Korea is a very special and complex situation. Again, I think our President is following the correct steps.

Had I had the opportunity, I probably would have advised a greater relationship in terms of visitations and otherwise with the regime in North Korea, assuming the opportunity had been provided, but that government completely abandoned the commitments they had made earlier, and indeed the commitments which presumably they were continuing with this administration of President George Bush.

I will not get involved in the various details there, but I am gravely concerned about the some 37,000 men and women in the Armed Forces who are essential on that border to show the resolve of this country to protect South Korea and to try to promote first the deterrence of any combat and then perhaps promote closer relationships between the North and the South. Those forces, together with other associated forces on standby, are in the area of North and South Korea for peaceful purposes.

I do not know what will evolve from the efforts by the administration, which I think are very positive. The administration has sent a high-ranking official over there to see whether, in working with our principal allies on this matter—Japan, China, Russia—we

can work together as a group of nations to once again bring back a course of action which will involve the cessation of the manufacture of weapons of mass destruction by North Korea and to foster a closer and more peaceful relationship with those two countries and North Korea as it relates to the neighboring countries in that area of the world, and hopefully to curtail the continued export by North Korea of weapons of mass destruction to other nations.

I return to this whole subject of the consultation and its importance at this particular time because of the complexity and the difficulty of the American people to really fully grasp the seriousness of this situation in Iraq and the threat posed by Saddam Hussein.

I saw where there is being planned what has been termed a peaceful march, a protest march, protesting the possibility of military engagement with Iraq at some point in time. I underscore that our President has made no decision about that and repeatedly says he has made no decision about it.

For over 5 years during the war in Vietnam, I was privileged to serve in the Navy Secretariat. I remember so many times coming up to the Hill to testify. I remember the widening gap between the Congress of the United States and the administration in that period of time because of the different views with regard to that conflict. Who suffered the most? It was really the men and women of the Armed Forces who were courageously fighting in that war.

I suppose at no time in the long public career which I have been privileged to have in this country have I had such heartfelt compassion for the men and women in the Armed Forces than in that period. They would come home on leave or come home wounded or tragically, in many cases, not come home as a consequence of being a casualty on the battlefields, battlefields which I visited on occasion, and the ships, and they would come home to a nation that did not understand what they were doing, a nation that was hostile to them individually and collectively, as well as to the families of those service persons.

Strengthening the consultation between the Congress and the executive branch at this time is essential to see that that chapter in American history is never repeated.

Today we have an all-volunteer force, and I think it is magnificent. I do not think we have to return to the draft—but I will save that for another day—because I experienced the draft periods. I was privileged to serve briefly in a very modest way in the Navy in the concluding months of World War II when the draft was on. I happened to volunteer at 17. Most of my age group at that time did volunteer for selective service. I served again in the Korean war, briefly again in Korea. Again, it was a draft situation. I do not want to return to those periods where men and

women—well, in those days men were drafted. Any future draft would have to involve both sexes, but that is a subject for another time.

I harken back to those periods of Vietnam, and I will watch very carefully what transpires in the next few days during this hopefully peaceful protest of the policies of the Government as they relate to the possible use of our troops in the war.

I want to recount one other chapter which I will never forget. My recollection is it was Saturday afternoon and I was in my office and my beloved, dear friend John Chafee, who used to sit right at that desk, was Secretary of the Navy and I was Under Secretary, and Secretary Laird telephoned me and said: I would like to have you and John Chafee go down to The Mall and take a look at another demonstration—by the young men and women of that era—in protest to Vietnam and come back and have a talk with me.

I remember so well that in those days we were all dressed up in our business suits even though it was a Saturday. We used to work pretty much 6 days a week during that war. We dispensed with our chauffeur-driven cars. We got in an old car and drove down to The Mall in some sort of cobbled together set of gym clothes, or whatever we had on. We blended right into that crowd. I can see it as clearly this moment as I did then.

Estimates were there were close to a million—I want to repeat that—close to a million young men and women. There was no particular anger, but they were protesting the war in Vietnam and the impact that war was having on their lives, their future, and their loved ones or friends or otherwise who had suffered the consequences of serving in uniform in that period. I do not want to see a return to that.

I remember we went back and talked to Secretary of Defense Laird about what we had seen, and I can see him now. He was very concerned because we did not have in place then a clear policy by which at some point in time we as a nation had to come to the conclusion that we had to basically make an honorable and dignified exit in that situation. That is for another day for historians to examine. It is emblazoned in my mind. I do not see nor do I sense among our people across the Nation today any feeling that such magnitude of a problem exists at this point in time with regard to Iraq.

Nevertheless, those situations come about sometimes quickly. That is why I will always be an advocate—whether it is the Bush administration, whether it is the Clinton administration, the Carter administration, or the previous Bush administration; I have worked with them all; I have been privileged to work in this body a quarter of a century—why I have been a steadfast proponent for consultation. I will continue. I hope it is not misconstrued by way of criticism. It is constructive thinking and drawing upon my own,

you might say limited, experiences in previous military conflicts in this country.

I recall at the conclusion of World War II when those in uniform came home. They were welcomed with open arms. It is impossible in these few minutes to describe the gratitude of the Nation, of the world, for the participation of those upward 16 million who served in that conflict and how all doors were open when they came home.

That was not present in Korea. It is why it is called the forgotten war. When they came back, there was no warm reception. We read something about it, but we were not entirely sure what it was they were fighting for over there. It is called the forgotten war. Over 50,000 men, and some women, from the United States of America gave their lives in that conflict. That is why it is called the forgotten war. Fortunately, today there are a number of things that have taken place to properly put in perspective the enormous sacrifice this country gave to secure for South Korea the freedoms they have enjoyed, the freedoms that have flourished. It is with a certain sense of sadness I read from time to time now that certain elements of the South Korean people resent our presence there.

The principle focus of these remarks is to reflect in the quiet moments at the end of a long day in the Senate a subject I feel strongly about, the consultation between the executive branch—whatever President it would be—and his principal Cabinet and other officers with this body, particularly in times as stressful and as complex as we are now facing here with the Iraqi situation or with the Korean situation.

I encourage the Department of Defense at the earliest point to release such statistics they keep with regard to the consulting process, the number of times that the Secretary of Defense has been up to brief the Congress—as they are going to do tomorrow. To the extent I can reflect on those brief remarks that I make to our conference, they were done in a constructive tone, a noncritical tone, and against the background that I briefly described of what I have experienced in my years as a public servant in times that are parallel, in many respects, to what we have now with the extraordinary tensions in this world as a consequence of terrorists, as a consequence of a despot such as Saddam Hussein.

Much is unknown about the Government of North Korea and its principal leaders. That is, in itself, very difficult. We have so little insight into that regime and particularly the leader of that nation at this time.

I conclude by saying I will continue to speak out. If I feel strongly enough I will criticize. I have been known to do it. At this time I am trying to provide an element of constructive leadership as it relates to my good friend and longtime friend. When I was in the Navy, Secretary Rumsfeld was on President Nixon's staff in the White

House, and we have known each other from that period of time. We formed a friendship then and have seen each other in the intervening years. We remain trusting and good, close working colleagues. Now and then he has a few choice words about me about some of the things I have done over here. He was not entirely pleased with my efforts on TRICARE For Life and current receipts, but those are honest differences between public servants.

In this instance, what I said at that conference was done in a heartfelt, constructive manner and it was not in any way directed it as a personal criticism against any of the President's Cabinet or the President himself. It was done simply to lay down a format for consultation with this body in the weeks and months to come, as we are continuing to lead as a nation to secure freedom in this world and a greater degree of peace for others.

Tomorrow's hearing will be very important before the Senate Armed Services Committee. I am confident the Secretary will share such information that is essential for us to perform our functions.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
Washington, DC, January 8, 2003.

Hon. DONALD H. RUMSFELD,  
Secretary of Defense, the Pentagon, Washington, DC

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We are writing to request that you or your Deputy, together with Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman General Richard B. Myers, USAF, testify before the Armed Services Committee next week, in both open and closed session, on current and potential U.S. military operations. In particular, we request that you discuss the commitment of military forces in and around Afghanistan allocated to the global war on terrorism, the buildup of U.S. military personnel and equipment in the Persian Gulf region to confront the threat posed by Iraq, and potential military commitments in support of a diplomatic solution to the enhanced tensions on the Korean Peninsula.

As the 108th Congress convenes, our nation is facing a broad range of national security challenges. Together with a large coalition of nations, our troops are engaged in the second year of operations in Afghanistan; on an almost daily basis, U.S. military forces are deploying to areas around Iraq; and for the past month, we have witnesses escalating tension over the North Korean nuclear weapons program.

Our Committee last conducted hearings on Iraq in September of 2002, prior to the vote on the resolution to authorize the use of force against Iraq, followed by a briefing in December. We had comprehensive hearings on Afghanistan in July 2002, and North Korea in March 2002, when the combatant commanders responsible for those regions testified.

As the new Congress convenes, and the Committee has a large number of new Members, it is essential to our oversight responsibilities to gain a timely update on vital national security issues in order to fulfill our constitutional responsibilities.

Sincerely,

JOHN WARNER.  
CARL LEVIN.

Mr. WARNER. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALENT). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MAKING MAJORITY PARTY APPOINTMENTS—Continued

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I will take just a very brief moment to update our Members as to where we are in our recent discussions. We have spent most of today, while debate has been underway, continuing discussions in terms of the committee resolution. Pending on the floor is that resolution making the majority party appointments for the 108th Congress. A number of the issues have been raised, both on the floor as well as between the leaders, and we have made tremendous progress. We have, over the course of the day, resolved many of the concerns that have been raised. I believe we are very close to working out an agreement that will let us adopt the respective committee resolution—and very quickly begin work on the appropriations bill.

My hope is that over the course of this evening and in the morning, the last of these issues will have been worked through and we can achieve the objective of organizing the committees.

I will say that as a backstop, or a preventive measure, I am compelled tonight to file cloture on the resolution in the event—again, this is not anticipated at all because of the great progress that has been made—in the event that we are unable to reach an agreement on the committee resolution. Again, I am very hopeful that early tomorrow we will be ready to pass the respective party resolutions and begin the appropriations process.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. FRIST. I send a cloture motion to the desk to S. Res. 18 making majority party appointments for the 108th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. Res. 18, a resolution making majority appointments to committees.

Bill Frist, Mitch McConnell, Ted Stevens, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Larry E. Craig, Conrad R. Burns, Orrin Hatch, Norm Coleman, Pete Domenici, Pat Roberts, R.F. Bennett, Michael B. Enzi, George Allen, James Talent, Gordon Smith, James M. Inhofe, Richard Shelby, John W. Warner, Jim Bunning, Chuck Grassley, John Ensign, Rick Santorum, Lincoln Chafee, George V. Voinovich, Jeff

Sessions, C.S. Bond, Susan Collins, Mike DeWine, Thad Cochran, Olympia J. Snowe, John McCain, Peter Fitzgerald, Sam Brownback, Lindsey Graham, John E. Sununu, Jon Kyl, Lamar Alexander, Elizabeth Dole, John Cornyn, Craig Thomas, Judd Gregg, Don Nickles, Richard G. Lugar, Trent Lott, Wayne Allard, Lisa Murkowski, Saxby Chambliss, Arlen Specter, Chuck Hagel, Mike Crapo.

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. FRIST. I yield.

Mr. REID. I say, through the Presiding Officer, to the majority leader, there have been a lot of speeches on the floor today. People said what they said. I think everything has been said, but not quite everyone has said it.

I feel good about the progress that has been made. However, I say to the majority leader, you and Senator DASCHLE are really close to being able to work something out. This is where it really gets hard. This is where you and Senator DASCHLE really have to show your leadership. I am confident that will happen. It would be good for the institution if we could get this done. We could move on, as the leader knows, to the appropriations bills which need to be done.

In spite of the threatening nature of the speeches on both sides today, tomorrow will be a better day. I am hopeful and very confident, and so is Senator DASCHLE, that we can work this out. I express to the majority leader my wishes for a productive final half yard to the goal line.

Mr. FRIST. Again, progress has been made. I appreciate the comments. I expect continuing progress to be made such that tomorrow we will have a very successful day in progressing the agenda that the American people expect.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. In the last Congress Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred March 6, 2001 in Middleburg, PA. A gay man was severely beaten by two neighbors. Michael Aucker, 41, and two brothers,

Todd Justin Clinger, 20, and Troy Lee Clinger, 18, were drinking beer in a trailer when the brothers thought Aucker made a sexual advance towards them. Police said the brothers took Aucker out on the deck and stomped on him with heavy work boots. Aucker was discovered a day and a half later by another neighbor and co-worker. He was in a coma and every bone in his face and nose were broken. I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

#### SITUATION IN THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise to call my colleagues' attention to a situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Last month, the parties to the bloody conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo signed an accord intended to end the country's 4-year civil war. But central Africans may not have much reason to celebrate yet, because unless this step is accompanied by meaningful new initiatives, the agreement promises little change from the insecurity and repression that have killed millions of their countrymen and dominated their lives throughout the conflict.

As the outgoing chairman and incoming ranking Democratic member of the Senate Subcommittee on African Affairs, I have monitored events in the Congo in recent years, and I must share some of this skepticism. The international community has been eager to certify a withdrawal of foreign forces so that it could move the Congo file out of the international crisis bin and into the overstuffed stack of civil collapses. Consequently, the world has demanded very little of the signatories to this new accord. Meanwhile, the demands of the Congolese people appear to have not been taken into account at all.

The agreement provides for Joseph Kabila, who was installed as President in Kinshasa after his father's assassination, to remain in the Presidency, and establishes four Vice-Presidential positions to accommodate his own party, the two major armed rebel groups, and the unarmed political opposition. But neither the President nor this bevy of Vice-Presidents can boast of any real political legitimacy, and thus far plans to ensure an eventual democratic transition have a feeble, wishful quality that suggests no one takes them terribly seriously.

Intercommunal tensions in Eastern Congo continue to simmer violently in the context of atrocious governance, but this is treated as an extraneous and inconvenient detail. Violence continues to rage in the Ituri region, displacing tens of thousands, it is clear,